

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, and 23-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and no claims have been cancelled. Claims 6, 12, 16, and 22 have been cancelled previously. Applicants are not conceding in this application that any claim is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite a “method executable by a computer of automatically customizing a user interface, including, in relevant part, “displaying on a display an object within the user interface.” These amendments are intended merely to provide improved clarity, and contain no new subject matter. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification as filed in at least paragraphs [0017] and [0019] and FIG. 1 (computer 12; I/O device 22, which may include a CRT, LED screen, hand-held device, or monitor/display, among others, as described in paragraph [0019]).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Beauregard *et al.* (US Pub. 2002/0156774, hereinafter, “Beauregard”), or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Beauregard in view of Bodin *et al.* (US Pat. 7,310,636, hereinafter, “Bodin”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as neither Beauregard nor the combination of Beauregard and Bodin teaches or suggests each and every feature claimed herein.

For example, Applicants submit that neither Beauregard nor the combination of Beauregard and Bodin teaches or suggests the feature of “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object ... wherein the plurality of shortcuts is automatically adjusted based on the application that manages the object” (claim 1, lines 6-10, and similarly recited in claim 11, lines 8-12; claim 14, lines 11-12; and claim 20, lines 6 and 9-13). In the Office Action, the Office asserts that Beauregard anticipates the claimed invention including this feature at paragraphs [0028], [0034], [0160], [0171]-[0173], [0180]-[0183], and [0378]-[0381]. Applicants submit, however, that none of these passages, or the balance of the Beauregard reference, teaches, “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object ... wherein the plurality of shortcuts is automatically adjusted based on the application that manages the object.” Quite the opposite, Beauregard teaches that “context independence is *essential* to the effectiveness of [Beauregard's] present invention.” (Beauregard, [0140], lines 1-2 (emphasis added).) Context independence refers to the invention's ability to “work[] in the same way, no matter what context the user is working in when he requests a service” (*id.*, lines 2-4). Beauregard's ActiveWords system is designed to compliment application text services (such as those of the Microsoft Word application) (*id.*, lines 8-12), and work in the background, taking appropriate action when it senses that the user has typed an action word (*id.*, [0138], lines 1-2). Active words are those stored in a word base with an associated script which is executed when the active word is typed by the user. (*Id.*, [0155]-[0157].) The invention is designed to work the same way “if the user is working in an application program, a utility program, an Internet browser, or in an operating system work space” (*id.*, [0140], lines 4-6). These teachings clearly fail to teach, and in fact teach away from,

the claimed feature of “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object ... wherein the plurality of shortcuts is automatically *adjusted based on the application that manages the object.*”

At paragraph [0172], cited by the Office, Beauregard teaches an exception to the theme of context independence, wherein “scripts within wordbase 340 can ... be qualified. For example, a script can be designated as 'only' if a user only wants an action word to cause a function within a certain environment (e.g., a replacement only in his e-mail application, but nowhere else). A script can also be 'contra' indicated if a user does not want an action word to cause a function within certain environments (e.g., perform a replacement of text unless he is in his e-mail application).” ([0172], lines 1-8.) However, Applicants submit that this feature of Beauregard also fails to teach the claimed feature of “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object ... wherein the plurality of shortcuts is *automatically* adjusted based on the application that manages the object” because, in order to respond differently in different computing environments, a user of Beauregard's invention would have to pre-set the qualifier or contra-indication. Beauregard's invention explicitly requires that “all commands are ... user-defined” (abstract). Therefore, Beauregard's command qualifications and contra-indications also do not teach “*automatically* adjust[ing] based on the application that manages the object.”

Further, Applicants submit that Beauregard fails to teach the feature of “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object ... wherein the plurality of shortcuts is automatically adjusted based on ... a history of object operations performed by the user to manage the object” (claim 1, lines 6-11, and similarly recited in claim 11, lines 8-13; claim 14, lines 11-13; and claim 20, lines 6 and 9-14). As discussed above, Beauregard teaches the use of specifically user-set commands, or “ActiveWords,” which do not allow for automatic adjustment of the shortcuts. Beauregard's teaching of archiving every word the user types, and the context in which it was typed also fails

to teach automatically adjusting the plurality of shortcuts based on a history of object operations, as Beauregard merely teaches that the archive is used “to determine the productivity benefit the user enjoys from using the word substitution capability of [Beauregard's] invention.” ([0378].) No adjustment of the ActiveWord commands is taught in connection with the archival of the user's typing history.

Still further, Applicants submit that Beauregard fails to teach the features of “displaying an object within the user interface” and “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object” (claim 1, lines 5-6, and similarly recited in claim 11, lines 5 and 8; claim 14, lines 5 and 8; and claim 20, lines 6 and 9), as Beauregard teaches the use of “simple, language-based commands” (abstract) which “allow a user to launch applications, navigate within applications and control application functions by using their natural language rather than dragging and clicking with a pointing device such as a mouse.” ([0033].) Applicants submit this not only fails to teach, but in fact teaches away from “displaying an object within the user interface” and “displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object” as claimed herein, because it preferentially teaches text commands instead of displayed objects and displayed shortcuts. For similar reasons, Beauregard also teaches away from Bodin's system of presenting information through a user interface.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bodin fails to teach or suggest, and further, is not alleged to teach or suggest, the claimed features discussed above, which are not taught by Beauregard. In view of at least the deficiencies in the prior art references discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the methods recited in independent claims 1, 11, 14, and 20 are not unpatentable over Beauregard, or over Beauregard in view of Bodin. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

With respect to dependent claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-25, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1, 11, 14, and 20, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) to dependent claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-25.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jayme M. Torelli/
Jayme M. Torelli
Reg. No. 62,735

Date: May 8, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047